

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed January 23, 2009, claims 1-20 are rejected. In response, claims 1, 9, 10, 16, and 17 have been amended, claims 15 and 20 have been canceled, and claims 21 and 22 have been added. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1, 2, and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakano et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0128768A1, hereinafter “Nakano”). Claims 3, 4, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano. Additionally, claims 9 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano in view of Gilmartin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,013,242, hereinafter “Gilmartin”). However, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over Nakano and Gilmartin for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite in part:

“wherein the arrangement displays to a user, who has input one of the predetermined destinations into the arrangement, navigation information, wherein the navigation information includes:
a description of the current coordinate field; and
a description of the next coordinate field for reaching the destination;
wherein the navigation information is obtained directly from a data record in a database; and
wherein no navigation related calculation is performed using at least one data record in the database to obtain the navigation information.” (emphasis added)

Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, original claim 1, page 1, lines 3-14, page 2, lines 27-30, page 5, lines 1-10, and the paragraph between page 5, line 28 and page 6, line 3.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Nakano does not disclose “*wherein the navigation information is obtained directly from a data record in a database; and wherein no navigation related calculation is performed using at least one data record in the database to obtain the navigation information*” (emphasis added), as recited in

amended claim 1. In particular, Applicant respectfully asserts that Nakano discloses the opposite of the above-identified limitation.

With reference to Fig. 1 and Fig. 24, Nakano discloses that a center station includes a map data storage unit (23), which stores map data on which the route guide information is based, see also paragraphs [0074], [0077], [0080], [0130], [0138], and [0155]. With reference to Fig. 12, Fig. 22, Fig. 25, and Fig. 28, Nakano discloses flowcharts showing the process of generating the route guide information at the center station according to the three embodiments of Nakano. In particular, as shown in Fig. 12, Fig. 22, Fig. 25, and Fig. 28 respectively, steps S1004-S1009, steps S3004-S3009, steps S4004-S4009, and steps S6004-S6009 describe how the route guide information is generated based on map data stored in the map data storage unit (23). Each of the steps S1004-S1009, steps S3004-S3009, steps S4004-S4009, and steps S6004-S6009 includes a first step of selecting a recommended route from a specified starting point to a specified destination point, a second step of setting guide points on the found recommended route, a third step of setting a detailed route area surrounding each guide point, a fourth step of finding a recovery route for getting the vehicle back to the recommended route, a fifth step of setting guide points where the guide information should be presented, and a sixth step of generating the route guide information, see also paragraphs [0130], [0131], [0133], [0134], [0137], and [0138]. Each of the first five steps includes navigation related calculations using the map data stored in the map data storage unit (23). The sixth step, which involves generating the route guide information, is based on the first five steps. That is, Nakano discloses that generating the route guide information involves navigation related calculations using the map data stored in the map data storage unit (23). In other words, Nakano discloses that navigation related calculations are performed using the map data in the map data storage unit (23) to obtain the route guide information. As a result, Nakano discloses that the route guide information is not obtained directly from the map data in the map data storage unit (23). Because Nakano discloses that the route guide information is not obtained directly from the map data in the map data storage unit (23) and because Nakano discloses that navigation related calculations are performed using the map data in the map data storage unit (23) to obtain the route guide information, Nakano discloses the opposite of the limitation “*wherein the*

navigation information is obtained directly from a data record in a database; and wherein no navigation related calculation is performed using at least one data record in the database to obtain the navigation information” (emphasis added), as recited in amended claim 1.

Because Nakano does not disclose the above-identified limitation of claim 1, Nakano does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. Because Nakano does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Nakano.

Dependent Claims 2-9

Claim 9 has been amended to correct an informality. Support for the amendment to claim 9 can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, the paragraph between page 3, lines 29 and page 4, line 2. Claims 2-9 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-9 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, claims 3 and 4 may be allowable for further reasons respectively, as described below.

Claim 3 recites in part that “the coordinate system comprises a linear system of coordinates with x, y coordinates which divides the search area into coordinate fields of 50 meters by 50 meters” (emphasis added). Nakano teaches a coordinate field having a radius of 3 Km, see paragraph [0097] and [0133]. The Office Action states that the difference in size of the coordinate fields is a design choice. The Office Action further states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Nakano by combining different sizes of a coordinate field to vary and view a search area. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Dividing the search area into coordinate fields of 50 meters by 50 meters, is advantageous for mobile use because in urban areas such a division makes the coordinate fields easily distinguishable for a user and not so large that ambiguous routes often result, see Applicant’s Specification at page 3, lines 6-12. The 3 Km-radius coordinate field taught in Nakano may not be ideal for mobile use in urban areas. For example, a 3 Km-radius coordinate field has a size over 28,274,333 square meters. That is, the size of a 3 Km-radius coordinate field is more than 11,309 times of the size of a coordinate field of

50 meters by 50 meters, which is 2,500 square meters. Thus, in densely populated urban area, using 3 Km-radius coordinate fields may result in ambiguous routes. Thus, Applicant asserts that it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Nakano. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that claim 3 is patentable over Nakano.

Claim 4 recites in part that “the database is situated locally in the arrangement” (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully asserts Nakano does not teach the above-identified limitation of claim 4.

With reference to Fig. 1 and Fig. 24, Nakano teaches a terminal and a center station, which includes a map data storage unit (23), see also paragraphs [0074], [0077], [0130], and [0138]. The map data storage unit (23) stores map data on which the route guide information is based. That is, Nakano teaches that the database is located at a central server. Because Nakano teaches that the database is located at a central server, Nakano does not teach that the database is located locally with the terminal. Additionally, Nakano, in particular paragraph [0106], teaches that a database can be searched using a keyword to specify a destination point and such database may be stored in the terminal or the center station. That is, Nakano teaches that the terminal may include a local database to specify a destination point. However, Nakano does not teach that the terminal includes a database that stores map data on which the route guide information is based. Thus, Nakano does not teach “the database is situated locally in the arrangement” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 4.

Independent Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended in a similar fashion as claim 1. The difference between claim 10 and claim 1 is that claim 10 recites in part:

“wherein the navigation information only includes:
a description of the current coordinate field; and
a description of the next coordinate field for reaching the destination;”
(emphasis added).

Support for the amendments to claim 10 can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, original claim 1, page 1, lines 3-14, page 2, lines 27-30, page 5, lines 1-10, and the paragraph between page 5, line 28 and page 6, line 3.

Because of the similarities between claim 1 and claim 10, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 1 apply also to claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 10 is not anticipated by Nakano. Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts Nakano does not disclose the above-identified limitation of claim 10.

As described above, with reference to Fig. 12, Fig. 22, Fig. 25, and Fig. 28 of Nakano, steps S1004-S1009, steps S3004-S3009, steps S4004-S4009, and steps S6004-S6009 describe how the route guide information is generated based on map data stored in the map data storage unit (23). Each of the steps S1004-S1009, steps S3004-S3009, steps S4004-S4009, and steps S6004-S6009 includes a first step of selecting a recommended route from a specified starting point to a specified destination point, a second step of setting guide points on the found recommended route, a third step of setting a detailed route area surrounding each guide point, a fourth step of finding a recovery route for getting the vehicle back to the recommended route, a fifth step of setting guide points where the guide information should be presented, and a sixth step of generating the route guide information. That is, the route guide information includes at least a recommended route and a recovery route for getting the vehicle back to the recommended route. Because the route guide information includes at least a recommended route and a recovery route for getting the vehicle back to the recommended route, Nakano does not disclose that the route guide information includes only a description of the current coordinate field and a description of the next coordinate field for reaching the destination. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Nakano does not disclose the above-identified limitation of claim 10.

Dependent Claims 11-14 and 16

Claim 16 has been amended to correct an informality. Support for the amendment to claim 16 can be found in Applicant's specification at, for example, the paragraph between page 3, lines 29 and page 4, line 2. Claims 11-14 and 16 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the independent claim 10. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 11-14 and 16 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10. Additionally, claim 12 includes the same limitation as claim 4, namely "the

database is situated locally in the arrangement” (emphasis added). Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 4 apply also to claim 12.

Independent Claim 17

Claim 17 has been amended in a similar fashion as claim 1. Support for the amendments to claim 17 can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, original claims 1 and 4, page 1, lines 3-14, page 2, lines 27-30, page 5, lines 1-10, and the paragraph between page 5, line 28 and page 6, line 3. Because of the similarities between claim 1 and claim 17, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 1 apply also to claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 17 is not anticipated by Nakano. Additionally, claim 17 includes the same limitation as claim 4. Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 4 apply also to claim 17.

Dependent Claims 18 and 19

Claims 18 and 19 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the independent claim 17. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 18 and 19 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 17. Additionally, claim 19 includes the same limitation as claim 3, namely “the coordinate system comprises a linear system of coordinates with x, y coordinates which divides the search area into coordinate fields of 50 meters by 50 meters” (emphasis added). Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 3 apply also to claim 19.

New Claims 21 and 22

New claims 21 and 22 have been added. Support for new claims 21 and 22 can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, original claims 3 and 9, page 1, lines 3-14, page 2, lines 27-30, page 5, lines 1-10, the paragraph between page 3, lines 29 and page 4, line 2, and the paragraph between page 5, line 28 and page 6, line 3.

Claim 21 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of the independent claim 10. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 21 is allowable at least based on

an allowable claim 10. Additionally, claim 21 includes the same limitation as claim 3. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 3 apply also to claim 21.

Claim 22 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of the independent claim 17. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 22 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 17.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: April 23, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111